

Matsui	Pitts	Smith (NE)
McCarthy (CA)	Platts	Smith (NJ)
McCarthy (NY)	Poe	Smith (TX)
McCaul (TX)	Pomeroy	Smith (WA)
McCollum (MN)	Porter	Snyder
McCotter	Price (GA)	Solis
McCrery	Price (NC)	Souder
McDermott	Pryce (OH)	Space
McGovern	Putnam	Spratt
McHenry	Radanovich	Stark
McHugh	Rahall	Stearns
McIntyre	Ramstad	Stupak
McKeon	Rangel	Sullivan
McMorris	Regula	Sutton
Rodgers	Rehberg	Tancred
McNerney	Reichert	Tanner
McNulty	Renzi	Tauscher
Meehan	Reyes	Taylor
Meek (FL)	Reynolds	Terry
Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
Melancon	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Michaud	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt
Millender-	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
McDonald	Ros-Lehtinen	Tierney
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Towns
Miller (MI)	Ross	Turner
Miller (NC)	Rothman	Udall (CO)
Miller, Gary	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Miller, George	Royce	Upton
Mitchell	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Mollohan	Rush	Velázquez
Moore (KS)	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Moore (WI)	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Moran (KS)	Salazar	Walden (OR)
Moran (VA)	Sali	Walsh (NY)
Murphy (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Walz (MN)
Murphy, Patrick	T.	Wamp
Murphy, Tim	Sánchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Murtha	Sarbanes	Schultz
Musgrave	Saxton	Waters
Myrick	Schakowsky	Watson
Nadler	Schiff	Watt
Napolitano	Schmidt	Waxman
Neal (MA)	Schwartz	Weiner
Neugebauer	Scott (GA)	Welch (VT)
Nunes	Scott (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Oberstar	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Obey	Serrano	Westmoreland
Olver	Sessions	Wexler
Ortiz	Sestak	Whitfield
Pallone	Shadegg	Wicker
Pascarell	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Pastor	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)
Paul	Sherman	Wilson (SC)
Payne	Shimkus	Wolf
Pearce	Shuler	Woolsey
Perlmutter	Shuster	Wu
Peterson (MN)	Simpson	Wynn
Peterson (PA)	Sires	Yarmuth
Petri	Skelton	Young (AK)
Pickering	Slaughter	

NOT VOTING—9

Cantor	Deal (GA)	Kanjorski
Davis, Jo Ann	Green, Gene	Pence
Davis, Tom	Johnson, E. B.	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1730

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve compensation benefits for veterans in certain cases of impairment of vision involving both eyes, to provide for the use of the National Directory of New Hires for income verification purposes, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide an educational assistance allowance for qualifying work study activities, and to authorize the provision of bronze representations of the letter 'V' for the

graves of eligible individuals buried in private cemeteries in lieu of Government-provided headstones or markers."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

JUDICIAL DISCLOSURE RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1130) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to extend the authority to withhold from public availability a financial disclosure report filed by an individual who is a judicial officer or judicial employee, to the extent necessary to protect the safety of that individual or a family member of that individual, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1130

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Judicial Disclosure Responsibility Act".

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF FAMILY MEMBERS.

Section 105(b)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "or a family member of that individual" after "that individual"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting "or a family member of that individual" after "the report".

SEC. 3. FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 105(b)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking "2005" each place that term appears and inserting "2009".

(b) REPORT CONTENTS.—Section 105(b)(3)(C) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) the nature or type of information redacted;

"(v) what steps or procedures are in place to ensure that sufficient information is available to litigants to determine if there is a conflict of interest;

"(vi) principles used to guide implementation of redaction authority; and

"(vii) any public complaints received relating to redaction."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ) and

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 1130, the Judicial Disclosure Responsibility Act. This legislation would amend the Ethics in Government Act by extending for an additional 4 years the Judicial Conference's authority to redact information, as necessary, to protect judicial employees and their families.

In 1998, Congress recognized the potential threats against individual judges and authorized the judicial branch to redact, as circumstances may require, information from financial disclosure reports before they are released to the public. This bill will allow the courts to continue taking necessary steps to protect judges, their staffs and their families.

Past incidences of violence against judges and their families demonstrate the need for this legislation. Most notable was the matter involving Judge Joan Lefkow. On April 6, 2003, a defendant was sentenced to 4 years imprisonment for soliciting the murder of Judge Lefkow. Two years later, that same judge returned to her home one day and found her husband and mother murdered by a former litigant whose case Judge Lefkow had dismissed.

We need to restore the judiciary's authority in appropriate circumstances to protect their personal information about residences and other frequented locations so as to better ensure their security and peace of mind.

The redaction authority has been used sparingly. In a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Judicial Conference reported that of the 3,942 Federal judiciary employees required to file financial disclosure reports in 2004, only 177 reports were redacted before release, and those only partially. It is with the greatest care that these documents are redacted to maintain an appropriate balance between protection of judiciary employees and the public's right to know about potential conflicts of interest.

This legislation was favorably reported out of the House Committee on the Judiciary. It would ensure the protection of personal information of the judicial branch while ensuring that the public retains its right to access annual disclosure reports.

We cannot expect judges to effectively carry out their duties if they are

forced to expose themselves and their loved ones to danger. The effectiveness of our court system depends on ensuring they can take reasonable steps to protect their safety.

I strongly support this important legislation, and urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of this legislation and believe it is necessary to protect judges, their family members and the other courthouse personnel by preventing disclosure of personal information that can be used to target and retaliate against them.

This legislation extends the authority of Federal judges and court personnel to redact sensitive and personal information from financial disclosure reports for security reasons. The current authority to redact personal and sensitive information from financial disclosure reports expired at the end of 2005.

Recent assaults and threats against Federal judges and their family members demonstrate the need for this redaction authority to continue. I believe this is an important safeguard to prevent vindictive offenders and litigants from seeking their revenge by harming or intimidating judges, probation officers and others.

H.R. 1130 extends the authority for 4 years, expands the coverage to include immediate family members, and improves the annual reporting requirements on the use of this authority. Although I favor a permanent extension of redaction authority, I support a 4-year extension to ensure the bill's timely passage by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the ranking member of the Courts, Internet and Intellectual Property Subcommittee.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1130, the Judicial Disclosure Act. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan and the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member SMITH, should be recognized for their leadership and efforts to shepherd this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is commonsense legislation that was unanimously approved by the House Judiciary Committee. It reauthorizes the Judicial Conference to redact certain personal and financial information that judges and judicial officers are required by the Ethics in Government Act to publicly disclose each year.

The authority was originally granted in 1998 and was subsequently renewed,

but expired on December 31, 2005. This legislation extends the authority until 2009.

Under H.R. 1130, Mr. Speaker, Federal judges and judicial officers are still required to submit information required by the Ethics in Government Act. The Judicial Conference would be permitted to redact personal and sensitive information from public disclosure to protect the safety of our judges, judicial officers and their families. Examples of the information that may be redacted include where they reside, where their spouses work or where their children attend school.

The Judicial Conference reported in 2005 that 3,942 Federal judiciary employees filed financial disclosure reports. Only 177 reports were partially redacted prior to release. Four redacted reports were based on specific threats, and another 137 reports were redacted based on general threats. We know these threats are real, and it only makes common sense to ensure that we do not needlessly expose personal and sensitive information of the judiciary's top officers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to support H.R. 1130, and hope that the other body will provide for its expeditious consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill strikes the proper balance between protecting judges, their staffs and their families, and balancing that with the public's right to know. With that, I urge its adoption by this House.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which will help protect our Nation's judges against those who may want to harm them, or who may threaten to harm them in efforts to influence outcomes of cases.

Until recently, when a judge or court official needed to submit a financial disclosure report, personal information about that individual could be redacted to prevent those who may intend harm from obtaining such information as the individual's home address.

Unfortunately, this redaction authority expired at the end of 2005. A recent incident in which a convicted felon requested the financial disclosure records of a judicial officer and those records contained such items as the work address of the officer's wife—highlights the need to reauthorize the authority to redact this type of personal information.

H.R. 1130, the judicial disclosure responsibility act, would amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to extend through 2009 the authority of the judicial conference to redact certain personal information from financial disclosure reports filed by judges. In addition, the bill would restrict disclosure of personal information about family members of judges when that disclosure might endanger them, in order to protect such information as the school location of a judge's children, the address of the workplace of a judge's spouse, and the like.

This narrowly tailored legislation will protect those that protect us—and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1130.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

NATIVE AMERICAN METHAMPHETAMINE ENFORCEMENT AND TREATMENT ACT OF 2007

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 545) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify that territories and Indian Tribes are eligible to receive grants for confronting the use of methamphetamine, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 545

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Native American Methamphetamine Enforcement and Treatment Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN METHAMPHETAMINE GRANTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 2996(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797cc(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, territories, and Indian tribes (as defined in section 2704)” after “to assist States”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and local” and inserting “, territorial, Tribal, and local”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, territories, and Indian tribes” after “make grants to States”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(C), by inserting “, Tribal,” after “support State”.

(b) *GRANT PROGRAMS FOR DRUG ENDANGERED CHILDREN.*—Section 755(a) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 3797cc-2(a)) is amended by inserting “, territories, and Indian tribes (as defined in section 2704 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797d))” after “make grants to States”.

(c) *GRANT PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS METHAMPHETAMINE USE BY PREGNANT AND PARENTING WOMEN OFFENDERS.*—Section 756 of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 3797cc-3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting “, territorial, or Tribal” after “State”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “, territorial, or Tribal” after “State”; and